be apportioned in the manner suggested. It may be recovered in the first instance from actual holders of registered lands and the remainder reserved to be collected from future registry-holders as they come in. What practical difficulties there may be in this arrangement it is not possible to see now. The question will be considered.

35. That either elaborate registration enquiries should be conducted or that the orders passed on summary enquiry by the Settlement department should not be considered as revenue decisions for the purposes of the Limitation Regulation.

Mr. Agasti Agasti (*Todupuzha*) suggested that either of the above prayers might be granted as under the present rules there was much room for reasonable complaint from the ryots.

Reply.—The first suggestion is opposed to the sense of the Assembly at the last session as to the mode of registration enquiries conducted according to the new scheme of settlement.

As regards the alternative prayer, there is evidently a misapprehension as to limitation, as the suits will be by one party against another to establish title and not against the Government to set aside an order.

36. Desirability of conducting the classification of properties in the presence of and in consultation with the owners and thadasters and the grant of sufficient time for preferring appeals.

Mr. Narayanan Madhavan Karthavu (Shertallay) said that the Settlement department now conducted classification work behind the back of the parties concerned and it would be desirable to introduce a rule enjoining that this should be done only in the presence of and in consultation with the proprietors and neighbouring ryots. He also requested that the time for preferring objection-petitions might be extended to 3 months as was the case before the introduction of the new scheme.

Mr. Varkey Oothuppu (Ettumanur) spoke in support.

Mr. Aiyappan Pillai (*Vaikam*) prayed for at least one month's time being allowed for presenting objection-petitions on rough pattahs, as nothing could be done within a week, which was the time now prescribed.

Reply.—Though there is no express rule on the subject, the restriction complained of has been practically removed. There is already a provision for the Additional Assistants hearing objections

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

on the spot within 15 days. This system has worked fairly well. There is no doubt that in some cases the ryots do not or cannot make their representations within the prescribed time. Even in such instances, a provision exists for revision by superior officers at the spot, besides the general power of revision in all cases vested in Government. Some time has to be fixed within which objection-petitions should be presented at the spot. Without such a provision, settlement work which has to pass through several stages will be unduly prolonged and this is not desirable.

37. Registry of trees standing on porambokes such as tank-bunds and river-banks in the names of the growers themselves.

Mr. M. Sivathanu Pillai (*Tovala*) said that formerly all tank-bunds and river-banks belonged to the people and it was at the present settlement that they were treated as poramboke. This was hard and he prayed that provision might be made for registering the trees in the names of the growers themselves.

Mr. V. Sankaranarayana Iyer B. A., B. L. (*Agastisvaram*) represented that in the ayacut of 1012 the bunds of tanks and banks of rivers had been registered in the names of private individuals and that it was only now that Government treated them as poramboke. He learnt that orders had been issued to lease them out at kudipattom rates and this virtually meant that Government were taking away from the ryots the lands which once belonged to them. Even if such lands could not be registered in the names of the holders, they should be permitted to take the manure leaves from the trees standing on them. This was even now allowed in some cases and the member prayed that the concession might be extended to all as a general rule.

Mr. Kanakku Mathevan Mathevan (*Nedumangad*) represented that tank-bunds were put up for the use of the ryots and not of the Government and that they should not therefore be treated as poramboke.

Reply.—The question whether these tank-bunds and river-banks are private or Government property is in every case a question of fact. Originally some of them might have been entered as registered holdings in the Ayacut, but in cases where they are actually found to be poramboke they have to be reserved as such. The existing rules sufficiently provide for the registry of trees on such lands on kuthagapattom without limit of time. It is to the advantage of the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly